



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

posed. The correction of proofs for such a volume is a sore burden for the most experienced reader. The whole undertaking is also thought to be a thankless task; Dr. Johnson says as much in the Preface to his Dictionary. But it is not thankless. There will be a sufficient number of persons in every age who will use the indispensable work of Professors Oldfather, Pease, and Canter, with grateful hearts, mostly thankful in silence, yet from time to time outspoken. The compilers of this *Index* have rendered an essential service to scholarship, to their fellow-men.

LANE COOPER

Cornell University

JUBILEE JAUNTS AND JOTTINGS. 250 Contributions to the Interpretation and Prosody of Old West Teutonic Alliterative Poetry. By Ernst A. Kock. (Ur "Festskrift utgiven av Lunds Universitet vid dess tvåhundrafemtioårsjubileum 1918.") Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N. F. Avd. 1. Bd. 14. Nr. 26.

Professor Kock's contribution to the 'Festskrift' published on the occasion of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Lund University consists in a textual study of some two hundred and fifty passages selected from the Old West Germanic alliterative poetry. It follows about the same lines as the author's previous studies in this field, namely his 'Interpretations and Emendations of Early English Texts,' *Anglia* xxv, 316-28, xxvi, 364-76, xxvii, 218-37, xlvi, 99-124, and his paper 'Zum Heliand,' *Zeitsch. f.d. Altert.* xlvi, 187-204—not to mention his separate studies of the relative pronouns, and Selma Colliander's investigation of 'parallelism' in the *Heliand* (Lund, 1912) which was undertaken under Professor Kock's direction. It also shows the same scholarly originality, fearlessness of attack, and vigor of expression which make the reading of his papers decidedly interesting. But this new monograph is naturally more comprehensive and presents a greater variety of interpretational problems. Practically all the (major) Old English poems come in for a share of comment; besides, the continental German *Heliand*, *Genesis*, *Hildebrand*, and *Muspilli* are properly taken up. The great advantages of treating the different West Germanic literatures, in a way, as a unit, in other words, the merits of the comparative method are thus brought home to us in a very direct and convincing manner. Who, indeed, would deny the fact that the customary separation of 'Anglo-Saxon' and 'Germanic' studies has been a prolific source of misapprehension, especially on the part of professional Germanists? In addition, also the Old Norse literature has been occasionally drawn upon with a view to throwing light on

obscure spots of Old English poetry, as illustrated, e.g., by the felicitous conjecture proposed for *Elene* 245: (*gesion*) *brimwudu snyrgan / under spellingum*. Instead of Thorpe's generally accepted emendation *swellingum* (from *swelling* 'swelling sail,' an unrecorded word), Kock suggests *snellingum* (ON. *snillingr* 'valiant man,' cp. *snellic særinc*, *Beow.* 690), which has the additional advantage of furnishing a thoroughly idiomatic construction of *under*. Besides the examples cited from the *Edda* (as, *langhofðuð skip und lóðondum*, 'long-headed ships beneath the sailors'), we might as well refer to the strictly analogous use of 'under' in connection with horses, as *Elene* 1193: *mearh under modegum*, or *Skáldskaparmál*, ch. 55 (*Kálfsvísa*): *en annar austr / und Aðilsí grár hvarfaði*.

The solid basis of Kock's investigation is an accurate knowledge of the old syntax and style, and in particular a close study of the all-important principle of variation or parallelism. He has so thoroughly familiarized himself with the Old Germanic poetry that in many cases he seems to be in a position intuitively to hit upon the exact meaning presumably intended by the author. Indeed, such a 'Stilgefühl' is, in a large sense, of the same kind as the feeling acquired by training and experience which guided the ancient poets in the handling of their material by the aid of a vast store of formulas, stereotyped modes of expression and motives. On the other hand, it is well known that Kock pays less deference than many others do to metrical criteria. He is certainly not a strict believer in the practical validity of Sievers' rules of versification, and emendations proposed in order to meet supposed metrical requirements carry little weight with him.

Of course, it must be admitted that the 'laws' of style are not absolute any more than the 'laws' of meter. 'Exceptions' to the rules may occur in either domain, and instances are not lacking in which the decision must ultimately rest with the individual student's subjective judgment. In fact, which one of us has not, from time to time, experienced a change of heart in his views on disputed passages?

A dilemma may naturally arise from the pressure of conflicting analogies. In his discussion of *Wanderer* 6-9, Kock argues for a new punctuation which is meant to obviate the necessity of altering the transmitted text, namely *Winemæga hyre / oft ic scoerde ana uhtna gehwylce, / mine ceare, cwiban*. Now it is quite true that this sort of parallelism is sufficiently supported by similar cases. But, on the other hand, the traditional punctuation which makes the sentence begin with *oft* has much to commend it. The adverb *oft*, it should be noted, is rather frequently found to introduce a statement of a general character, in particular at the opening of a poem or of a speech. Thus, e.g., *Beow.* 3077: *Oft sceall eorl monig*

anes willan / wræc adreogan, Fates of Men 1: Ful oft þæt gegongeð mid Godes meahatum, Wanderer 1: Oft him anhaga are gebideð. Close parallels of this function are readily recognized in the use of *fela*, as in *Beow.* 2426: *Fela ic on giogoðe guðræsa genæs, Wids.* 10: *Fela ic monna gefrægn mægbum wealdan, Gifts of Men 1: Fela bið on foldan forðgesynra etc.*, and of *monige*, cf. Sievers' note on *Heliand*, 1. Accordingly, *Oft ic sceolde ana uhtna gehwylce / mine ceare cwiban* still seems to me the better reading of *Wanderer* 8 f. Whether *hryre* of the preceding line should be changed to *hryres* or be considered a permissible *lapsus*, remains a matter of doubt.

Of general stylistic and syntactical features discussed I mention the interesting phenomenon of asyndetic parataxis of nouns and adjectives (p. 11, and *passim*), the use of the parenthetic exclamation (pp. 16–18), and the omission of the inflexion of adjectives and participles which qualify a preceding noun or are used predicatively (pp. 19 f.).

Regarding the first of these, it may be pointed out that, as a general rule, the type is: noun+compound noun, but also the opposite order seems to occur, as *Beow.* 1224: *windgeard weallas, Andr.* 494: *bryðbearn hæleð* (Cosijn: *hæleða*); cf. *undyrne cuð, Beow.* 150, 410. Also *ond* (*ne*) is sometimes met with in connection with similar groups of practically tautological nouns, as *Beow.* 1454: *brond ne beadomecas, 2660: byrne ond beaduscrud*, cf. 2322: (*lige befangen*), *bale ond bronde; 2449: eald ond infrod*.

As to the disregard of the proper inflexion of adjectives and participles under the conditions specified, the most interesting group of examples shows "a peculiarity not yet apprehended: the adjective may be endowed with an ending that agrees with the noun in number but not in case; the form used in nom.-acc. pl. is appended appositionally," e.g., *Elene* 991 ff.: *næs þa fricgendra . . . gad . . . feorran geferede* (Sievers: *gefederdra*). That even the complete lack of inflexion in such a case is a possibility, appears from the instructive passage, *Brunanb.* 40 ff.: *wæs his maga sceard, / freonda gefylled on folcstede, / forslegen* (varr.: *beslegen, beslagen, beslagen*) *æt sæcce.* The meaning 'deprive' very commonly assigned to this *gefyllan* is certainly spurious, though the varying readings of the last line show that the scribes themselves were in doubt about the context.

From what has been said, it is easily inferred that Professor Kock is not prone to improve the text by brilliant conjectures, but thinks it more important to study the precise meaning of words and phrases and especially to elucidate the context by correcting the punctuation. Yet a few emendations are put forward also by him as the most reasonable way out of a desperate difficulty. A really daring etymological guess

is offered on *fridhengest*, *Riddle* 23.4, the first element of which is explained as the Latin-Romanic *vered-*, *fred-* in *veredus*, *fredus*, *paraveredus*, German *Pferd*, etc. However, it must be added that an examination of the old Grein (*Bibliothek* i, 380) shows that even this guess, startling as it seems, is not new, for in a footnote the editor queries: "vgl. Ahd. *parafrit?*"

Naturally, there remains ample room for discussion in this large field of textual problems. To instance some cases. *Andr.* 569 ff. *ah he para wundra a, / domagende, dæl ænigne / fratre beode beforan cyðde*. Kock thinks that *he* must be an error for *ne* or *ne he*, which seems to me very unlikely on account of the unsatisfactory word-order resulting from that change. Somewhat more plausible is Krapp's *nænigne*. But the simplest and most natural solution appears to be the insertion of *ne* before *cyðde*.—*Andr.* 1376 f. *Hwæt, me eaðe ælmihtig God, / niða neregend* etc. To get rid of the anacoluthon, Kock postulates on original *me . . . niða neregeð*, 'will save me from tribulations,'—an alteration which is clearly open to linguistic objections. Indeed, Ettmüller's suggestion that *mæg alysan* may be supplied, in sense, from the preceding lines appears less hazardous. Even Root's double emendation *me eaðe mæg . . . niða generian* (or *-neregan*) seems, at least, possible, especially in view of the formula-like character of *eaðe mæg*.—Again, I do not feel quite sure that the adjective *sigerice* must be eliminated from the Old English dictionaries. It is to be admitted that in *Exodus* 563, *sigerice* looks like a noun: *gesittað sigerice be sæm tweonum, / beorselas beorna*. But in *Exodus* 27 its adjectival function is by no means improbable: *hu þas woruld worhte wiðig Drihten, / eorðan ymbhwyrft and uprodor / gesette sigerice*. Some little weight may be attached to the parallel passage, *Beow.* 92 ff., cf. 94: *gesette sigehrebig sunnan ond monan* etc. It is also well to remember that the Old Saxon adjective *heban-riki* (always in the combination *God hebanriki* or *hebanriki God*) was not admitted into the glossaries until the discovery of the *Genesis* fragments established its existence beyond doubt, cf. Braune's note on *Genesis* 25 and his Glossary.—*Andr.* 174. *þu scealt feran ond frið lædan*. The point which Kock makes in regard to the form *frið* has not become quite clear to me. "*Frið* for *frihð*=*ferhð* (cf. *stiðfrihp*, *Gen.* 107) is no scribal error, as the reader might infer from Holthausen's 'lies *ferð*' (Grein-Köhler, p. 882)." It is well known that *-frið* as the second element of compounds was liable to become *-ferð* (cf. Bülbring §572), and this seems to have occasioned a certain amount of confusion. But the author of the poem, unless his linguistic feeling had suffered a severe shock, no doubt meant *fer(h)ð* and nothing else, and there can hardly be any objection to correcting the scribe's *frið* to *fer(h)ð*. Similarly, I would not hesitate to change *friðgedal* in *Genesis* 1142: *þæt he friðgedal frem-*

man sceolde to ferhōgedal; for that compound certainly does not mean 'divortium a pace' (Grein), but is = *aldorgedal*, cf., e.g., *Genesis* 1071 f.: *oð þæt aldorgedal . . . freman sceolde*.—The simplification of *Waldere* i, 6 ff. by dropping *to dæge*, i.e.: *ne læt ðin ellen nu gyt / gedreasan, dryhtscape!* *Nu is se dæg cumen* had been already introduced in Holthausen's first edition (Göteborg, 1899), but has been abandoned in his later texts (in the *Beowulf* volume). The suggested reading is, of course, smooth and unquestionably tempting, but remembering the prolixity and phrasal repetition found in other passages of this poem, one does not feel justified in accepting it as final.

Taken all in all, these 'Jubilee Jaunts and Jottings' form an extremely valuable collection of interpretational notes—valuable even in those instances where we hesitate to follow the author's lead. Besides solving many problems, they are calculated to stimulate thought and to inspire others to a renewed examination of doubtful passages of our ancient poetry. No student, or editor, of Old English (and, in fact, Old Saxon) poems can fail to profit by them.

FR. KLAEBER

The University of Minnesota

**SAMUEL BUTLER, AUTHOR OF EREWHON (1835–1902):
a Memoir by Henry Festing Jones. London. Macmillan
and Company, Ltd. 1919. 8vo. 2 vols. 21 illustrations.
2 guineas (\$12.50).¹**

This is one of the most elaborate biographies of modern times, running to a total of about 1,030 pages and setting forth in minute detail the quiet life of a literary recluse. If the word recluse does not exactly fit Butler, at least it may be held that he went little into society and apparently made no effort to win or keep the friendship of more than three or four kindred spirits. Even in the world of literature something of the spirit of the recluse animated him; for he tells us that he made it a point never to write except on some subject on which he thought the general opinion was at fault, or at least widely at variance with his own. The more general the opinion, by the way, the more likely it was to be wrong; that, at least, is the impression one

¹ The following reviews have already appeared: J.M.M. in *The Athenaeum*, October 24, 1919, pp. 1060–1; *The Saturday Review*, November 8, 1919, cxxviii, 441–3; *The Spectator*, November 29, 1919, no. 4770, pp. 730–1; *Blackwood's Magazine*, November, 1919, ccvi, 709–14; Maurice F. Egan in *The New York Times Book Review*, January 15, 1920, pp. 1, 3; *The Times Literary Supplement*, London, October 16, 1919, pp. 553–4; Edward Shanks in *The London Mercury*, December, 1919, i, 164–75; Stuart P. Sherman in *The Evening Post Book Review*, January 31, 1920, pp. 1, 4; cf. editorial comment on this in *The New York Times*, February 8, 1920, entitled "Back to the Victorian."